RECEIVED
JUL 21 1982
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

No. 82-5102

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

ORLANDO JOHNSON, ~~et al.~~

Petitioner-Appellant

vs.

UNITED STATES Dist. Ct.
for the SOUTHERN Dist.
of OHIO, W. Div., et al.

Respondent-Appellees

JURISDICTIONAL STATEMENT
APPEAL FROM/ OR ALTERATIVELY
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO
THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

ELIZABETH M. DEAN, and
JOHN C. STANATAKOS,
Assistants Attorney General
State Office Tower,
30 East Broad Street
Columbus, Ohio43215

ORLANDO JOHNSON, pro se
Serial No. 146-602
P.O. Box 45699
Lucasville, Ohio 45699-0001

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

1.) Whether there was judicial usurpation of power by the U.S. District Court by its failure to enter judgment by default.

2.) Whether the U.S. Court of Appeals has so far departed from the accepted and usual course of judicial proceedings, or so far sanctioned such a departure by a lower court, as to call for an exercise of this Court's power of supervision.

3.) Whether the federal court of appeal has decided a federal question in a way in conflict with applicable decisions of this Court.

4.) Whether there exist circumstances rendering the State corrective process ineffective to protect petitioner's rights to exhaust state court remedies 28 U.S.C. 2254 (b) in the four (4) grounds for habeas corpus relief.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pages
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS	1
MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL	1
AFFIDAVIT	1
TABLE OF CASES	4
OTHER AUTHORITIES	4
APPEAL FROM/ OR ALTERATIVELY PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT	6
QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW	7
ORDERS AND ENTRY BELOW	8
JURISDICTION	9
CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED	11
STATEMENT OF THE CASE	11
FOR CONSOLIDATION AND HEARING WITH:	15
REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT	16
CONCLUSION	21
PROOF OF SERVICE	22

TABLE OF CASES

	Pages
Barker v. Wingo, 92 S.Ct. approximately p. 2182 (1972)	20
Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct. 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d 72 (1977)	9, 17
Bonanza Intern, Inc. v. Corceller, 480 F.2d 613.	18
Holt v. Pitts, 619 F.2d 558 (6th Cir. 1980)	19
Johnson vs. Jago, et al. Civil Rights Action, Case No. C-1-79-660, U.S.D.C. Cincinnati, Ohio (Pending)	11 14, 20
Johnson vs. Marshall, et al. Habeas Corpus, Case No. C-1-81-827, U.S.D.C. Cincinnati, Ohio; on appeal as Case No. 81-3741, U.S. 6th Cir. Ct. of Appeals. (1982).	10, 12 15, 20
Johnson vs. U.S. Dist. Ct. S.Dist. Ohio W.Div. et al. Petition for Writ of Man damus, U.S. 6th Cir. Ct. of Appeals, Case No. 82-8320. (1982).	12
Kerr v. U.S. District Court, 426 U.S. 394 (1976).	18
Rone v. Fireman, 473 F.Supp. 92 (1979)	13, 17, 20
Schlagenhauf v. Holder, 379 U.S. 104, 85 S.Ct. 234 (1964).	9, 16
State v. Cross, 26 Ohio St.2d 270, 271 N.E.2d 264 (June 23, 1971).	20
State v. Johnson, 57 Ohio App.2d 263, 387 N.E.2d 247 (June 22, 1978).	20

OTHER AUTHORITIES

	Pages
28 U.S.C. Rule 15	11, 12, 18, 19
28 U.S.C. Rule 17, S. Ct. Rules	9
28 U.S.C. Rule 19, S.Ct. Rules	10
28 U.S.C. Rule 19	12, 18
28 U.S.C. Rule 21, Fed. App. R.	9
28 U.S.C. Rule 21, S.Ct. Rules	10
28 U.S.C. Rule 27, Fed. App. R.	9
28 U.S.C. Rule 28.4 S.Ct. Rules	22
28 U.S.C. Rul3 33	13, 14, 18, 19
28 U.S.C. Rule 36	14, 18, 19
28 U.S.C. Rule 37	9, 18, 19
28 U.S.C. Rule 41, S.Ct. Rules	10
28 U.S.C. Rule 42	12
28 U.S.C. Rule 46, S.Ct. Rules	10
28 U.S.C. Rule 49	10, 12

	Pages
28 U.S.C. Rule 55	9, 19
28 U.S.C. Rule 57	12
28 U.S.C. 1253, S.Ct. Rules	9, 10, 15
28 U.S.C. 1254, S.Ct. Rules	9
28 U.S.C. 1343	11
28 U.S.C. 1651	9
28 U.S.C. 1746	16
28 U.S.C. 1874	9
28 U.S.C. 1915	1, 11, 13
28 U.S.C. 2101, S.Ct. Rules	9, 10, 15
28 U.S.C. 2201	12
28 U.S.C. 2202	12
28 U.S.C. 2241	10, 12
28 U.S.C. 2243	10, 12
28 U.S.C. 2253	15
28 U.S.C. 2254	7, 10, 12
U.S. Dist. Ct. Rule 3.10 S.D. Ohio W.D.	11
6th Cir. Rule 7, Fed App. Ct.	12
6th Cir. Rule 8, Fed. App. Ct.	9
42 U.S.C. 1981	11
42 U.S.C. 1983	11
42 U.S.C. 1985	11
42 U.S.C. 1986	12
O.R.C. 2945.71	15, 20
O.R.C. 2945.73	15, 20
O.R.C. 5145.04	17
O.R.C. 5145.20	17
O.R.C. 5145.22	17
(Amended Substitute Bill No. 76) AN ACT by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, Sec. 9.87 Section 6... Section 7.	11
U.S. Cong. Record Vol. 122, at p. 5645 (1976)	16
U.S. Constitution 1st Amend.	11
U.S. Constitution 5th Amend.	15
U.S. Constitution 6th Amend.	15
U.S. Constitution 14th Amend	11

IN THE

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

OCTOBER TERM, 1982

No. _____

ORLANDO JOHNSON, et al.

Petitioner-Appellant

vs.

UNITED STATES Dist. Ct.
for the SOUTHERN Dist.
of OHIO, W. Div., et al.

Respondent-Appellees

APPEAL FROM/ OR ALTERATIVELY
PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED
STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

The petitioner, Orlando Johnson, seeks direct appellate review/ or alteratively prays that a Writ of Certiorari issue to review the order of the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit entered on April 19, 1982.

ORDERS AND ENTRY BELOW

The District Court filed Order Feb. 4, 1982, setting either "...trial or default on March 22, 1982..." A copy of order is attached as Appendix A.

The Court of Appeals entered its Order denying Petitioner's motion for Petition for Writ of Mandamus on March 11, 1982. A copy of the order is attached as Appendix B.

The District Court filed Entry March 5, 1982, vacating trial date set for March 22, 1982, and denying default judgment. A copy of the entry is attached as Appendix C.

The Court of Appeals filed Order April 19, 1982, denying Motion for Stay and Reconsideration on Petition for Writ of Mandamus. (Two 2 pages). A copy of the order is attached as Appendix D.

The Court of Appeals filed Order June 25, 1982, denying habeas corpus relief. (Two 2 pages). A verbatim typed copy of the order is attached as Appendix E.

JURISDICTION

On April 19, 1982, the Court of Appeals entered its Order denying petitioner's Motion for Stay and Reconsideration, Sixth Circuit Rule 8 (b) (c) MOTIONS AND MOTION PRACTICE, Fed. R. App. P. 27 (a) (b) (c) on Petition for Writ of Mandamus, 28 U.S.C. § 1651, Fed. R. App. P. 21 (a) (b).

The jurisdiction of this Court is invoked for direct appellate review under Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States, Title 28 United States Code, sections 1253 § 2101 (b) (c) as incorporated into petitioner's Notice of Appeal with Certificate of Service, stamped Received May 10, 1982, by John P. Hehman, Clerk U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals. A copy of the Notice of Appeal and Certificate of Service is attached as Appendix P.

Or, alteratively, petitioner seeks Writ of Certiorari under Rules of the Supreme Court of the United States, Rule 17, Considerations Governing Review on Certiorari, section 1. (a) (c); and section 1254. Courts of appeal; certiorari; appeal; certified questions (1) (3).

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by case law of: Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct. 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d 72 (1977), one pertinent portion of the opinion which reads: "Indigent inmates must be provided at state expense with paper and pen to draft legal documents, with notarial services to authenticate them and stamps to mail them." At page 81.

Further jurisdiction is conferred to this Court by case law of: Schlagenhauf v. Holder, 379 U.S. 104, 85 S.Ct. 234 (1964), one pertinent portion of the opinion which reads: "The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure should be liberally construed, but they should not be expanded by disregarding plainly expressed limitations." At page 244.

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by 28 U.S.C. Rule 55. Default (a) Entry. (b) Judgment. (1) (2)

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by 28 U.S.C. Rule 37. Failure to Make or Cooperate in Discovery: Sanctions (b) Failure to Comply with Order. (C) pertinent part "...rendering a judgment by default against the disobedient party;"

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by 28 U.S.C. § 1874. Actions on bonds and specialties

> "In all actions to recover the forfeiture annexed to any articles of agreement, covenant, bond, or other specialty, wherein the forfeiture, breach, or nonperformance appears by default or confession of the defendant, the shall render judgment for the plaintiff for such amount as is due. If the sum is uncertain, it shall, upon request of either party, be assessed by a jury."

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by Rule 19, SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES, Review on Certiorari--How Sought--Parties: 4. "Parties interested jointly, severally, or otherwise in a judgment may join in a petition for a writ of certiorari therefrom; or any one or more of them may petition separately; or any two or more of them may join in a petition. When two or more cases are sought to be reviewed on certiorari to the same court and involve identical or closely related questions, it will suffice to file a single petition for writ of certiorari covering all cases."

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by 28 U.S.C. 2254 § 2241 § 2243.

Further jurisdiction to this Court is confereed by 28 U.S.C. Rule 49 Custody of prisoners in habeas corpus proceedings and/ or 28 U.S.C. RULES of the Supreme Court of the United States Rule 41 Custody of Prisoners in Habeas Corpus Proceedings: "Pending review in this Court of a decision in a habeas corpus proceeding commenced before a court, Justice, or judge of the United States for the release of a prisoner, a person having custody of the prisoner shall not transfer custody to another unless such transfer is directed in accordance with the provisions of this Rule. Upon application of a custodian showing a need therefor, the court, Justice or judge rendering the decision under review may make an order authorizing transfer and providing for the substitution of the successor custodian as a party."

Further jurisdiction to this Court, in petitioner 's habeas corpus, Johnson vs. Marshall, et al. Case No. 81-3741, is conferred by Notice of Appeal 28 U.S.C. § 1253 § 2101 (b) (c), from the United States Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, being received by that Court, June 30, 1982. Appendix G.

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by 28 U.S.C. Rule 21, The Petition for Certiorari, Rules of the Supreme Court.

Further jurisdiction to this Court is conferred by 28 U.S.C. Rule 46, (1)(2)(3)(4)(5)(6) Rules of the Supreme Court.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED

United States Constitution, 1st Amendment:

> Congress shall make no law...abridging...the right of the people to...petition the Government for a redress of grievances.

United States Constitution, 14th Amendment:

> ...nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

(Amended Substitute Senate Bill No. 76) AN ACT... enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio. Sec. 9.87 (A). SECTION 6.. SECTION 7.
A verbatim typed copy of the pertinent sections of this Bill is attached as Appendix H.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

November 28, 1979, Johnson vs. Jago, et al. Civil Action Case No. C-1-79-660, was filed under 28 U.S.C. § 1343. 42 U.S. § 1981 § 1983 § 1985, for being denied access to state and federal courts as guaranteed by the 1st and 14th Amendments the the U.S. Constitution, by an ongoing conspiracy from September 1978. Originally, Arnold R. Jago, Superintendent, Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, (hereinafter SOCF) Lucasville, Ohio; and, Paul Adams, Notary Public, State of Ohio, employed at SOCF, were the only two defendants, being sued in their official capities and individually. Demand for "JURY TRIAL" made and prayer for $145.000,00 in general damages and $20.000,00 in punitive damages sought. 1/

David S. Porter, Judge U.S. District Court signed the Order permitting said cause to proceed in forma pauperis 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a).

January 4, 1980, petitioner, Johnson, received Defendants' Motion for Extension of Time, until Jan. 22, 1980, to move or plead. Citing; S.D. Ohio R.3.10. Signed by John C. Stamatakos, Assistant Attorney General, State of Ohio.

1/ In April 1980, defendant Jago abandoned his employment as Superintendent, SOCF and Ronald C. Marshall was duly appointed as his successor.

January 8, 1980, Wallace B. Stein, Chief Record Clerk, SOCF personally served petitioner with Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support, signed by John C. Stamatakos, Counsel for defendants.

January 16, 1980, Order filed by the District Court granted De-Dendants until Jan. 22, 1980, to move or plead to the complaint. Signed by J. Vincent Aug. U.S. Magistrate.

January 24, 1980, petitioner Johnson's Motion in Opposition to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support; Motion for Leave to Amend Complaint and Memorandum in Support; attached Amended Complaint were filed in the District Court. In substance, restated the original Claims, and adding more facts, and 42 U.S.C. § 1986. 2/

According to letter dated Feb. 15, 1980, and copy of docket sheet of the proceedings from the District Court, on Jan. 24, 1980, petitioner's Motion for leave to Amend Complaint, and attached Amended Complaint were issued to Attorney General.

2/ Four (4) defendants were, also, added in their official capacities and individually: Bonding Company of Paul N. Adams, Notary Public; Lt. Crabtree, Mail & Visiting Department, SOCF; George F. Denton, Director Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections; James A. Rhodes, Governor, State of Ohio. 28 U.S.C. 15 (a)(b)(c)(d); and Rule 19(a). There was no change, at the time, in the amount of damages prayed for.

On Oct. 9, 1981, petitioner's habeas corpus 28 U.S.C. 2254 § 2241 § 2243, was filed in the District Court as Johnson vs. Marshall, et al. No. C-1-81-827, naming Ronald C. Marshall, Superintendent, SOCF as respondent, and attached Motion for an Order for Consolidation of Actions. 28 U.S.C. Rule 42(a); and pursuant to Rule 57 Declaratory Judgments 28 U.S.C. 2201 § 2202 Further relief (additional damages) of: $60.000,00 in general damages and for mental suffering and $15.000,00 in punitive damages from defendant Marshall, in his official capacity and individually; and $60.000,00 in general damages and for mental suffering and $15.000,00 in punitive damages from defendant Denton for causing petitioner to be transferred April 21, 1980, from SOCF during pendency of "other" federal habeas corpus proceeding, and not returning him to SOCF until September 1980, contrary to 28 U.S.C. Rule 49 Custody of prisoners in habeas corpus proceedings.

Oct. 9, 1981, the U.S. District Court denied petitioner's habeas corpus, Johnson vs. Marshall, et al. No. C-1-81-827. December 15, 1981, petitioner mailed a timely Expedited Appeal of said habeas corpus, and the petition for mandamus in the Civil Rights Action herein, to the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals requesting consolidation, Sixth Circuit Rule 7 (d) Companion Cases (b) Advancement of Hearing, due to an identical issue, and other closely related issues.

Without comment, on consolidation motion, the Appeals Court severed the two (2) cases: assigned Case No. 82-8320, to the mandamus action Johnson vs. U.S. Dist. Ct. S.Dist. Ohio, W. Div. et al., and denied relief April 19, 1982. Assigned Case No. 81-3741, to habeas corpus action Johnson vs. Marshall, et al., and denied relief June 25, 1982.

March 26, 1980, petitioner's First Set of Interrogatories (75) directed for defendant Adams to answer, and Certificate of Service, dated same day, were mailed via Regular U.S. Mail to William J. Brown, Attorney General, State of Ohio, 30 East Broad St. Columbus, Ohio. 28 U.S.C. Rule 33.

November 4, 1980, Robert A. Steinberg, U.S. Magistrate, signed a Order which was filed Nov. 5, 1980, in the District Court which reads in part: "Plaintiff filed a Motion to file an Amended Complaint in this action and attached a copy of his proposed Amended Complaint ...It is hereby ORDERED that Defendants move or plead to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint within ten days of receipt of this order."

November 25, 1980, Wallace E. Stein, Chief Record Clerk, SOCF personally served petitioner with Answer of Defendants Jago and Adams to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint. The signature of J. Anthony Logan as Assistant Attorney General, State of Ohio, appears on this document in liew of John C. Stamatakos.

December 2, 1980, petitioner's Motion for Appointment of Counsel, U.S.C. Title 28 § 1915 was filed in the District Court.

Order issued Denying Petitioner's Request for Appointment of Counsel Dated: Jan. 9, 1981, signed Robert A. Steinberg, U.S. Magistrate, filed Jan. 14, 1981.

At the time of this writing the District Court has been silent on petitioner's Request for the Services of Legal Counsel Amicus Curiae from the United States Department of Justice, filed Jan. 28, 1981. 3/

3/ Petitioner seeks, here, to bring himself within the ambient of the ruling in the class action lawsuit against officials of the, State of Ohio, at the Western Reserve Psychiatric Habilitation Center, in Rone et al. v. Fireman, 473 F.Supp. 92 (1979), wherein the United States of America was Plaintiff Intervenor on behalf of the patients. From page 106 of the original typed Memorandum Opinion and Order filed June 18, 1979, in the, Rone, decision:

> "The defendants have failed to provide mentally ill persons involuntarily confined at Western Reserve for purpose of treatment ready access to community resources in violation of the Fourteenth Amendment."

From page 5 of, the original typed, Memorandum Opinion and Order in the Rone decision:

> "By Order of February 22, 1977, this Court granted the former motion and certified as the class represented by the named plaintiffs the following:
>
> All persons who have at any time since March 2, 1976, occupied, or will at any time during the pendency of this action occupy any ward or facility as patients at Western Reserve Psychiatric Habilitation Center (formerly Hawthorn den State Hospital)."

Petitioner, Johnson, was involuntarily confined at Western Reserve Psychiatric Habilitation Center December 6, 1978, to December 26, 1978.

February 11, 1981, among some of the documents mailed via U.S. Certified Mail to John C. Stamatakos, Assistant Attorney General, State of Ohio, State Office Tower, 30 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio, were: Petitioner's First Set of Request for Admissions of Fact (10) for Defendant Adams to Answer. 28 U.S.C. Rule 36; and a "duplicate" copy of Petitioner's First Set of Interrogatories (75) for defendant Adams to Answer. 28 U.S.C. Rule 33.

March 19, 1981, Petitioner's Motion for Default Judgment and Notice of Application for Judgment and Hearing with attached Affidavit and Supporting Memorandum were filed in the District Court.

April 1, 1981, Petitioner's Supplementary Affidavit and offer of 27 Exhibits as Documentary Evidence Corroborating his Affidavit in Support of Motion for Default Judgment and Statement, were filed in the U.S. District Court.

May 21, 1981, petitioner received from the District Court an updated copy of the docket sheet of the proceedings in Johnson vs. Jago, et al. Case No. C-1-79-660. According to this document on July 15, 1980, "ORDER transferring case fm calendar of J. Porter to J. Speigel." August 8, 1980, "ORDER by J. Spiegel appointing J. St-Steinberg U.S. Magistrate to hear case & conduct hearings, etc."

Thus far, the District Court has not issued written or oral statement as to why this case was transferred from Judge Porter's calendar to Judge Speigel's calendar.

December 15, 1981, petitioner submitted a Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 82-8320, in the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals to compell the U.S. District Court at Cincinnati, Ohio to rule on his Motion for Default Judgment filed March 19, 1981, in Johnson vs. Jago, et al. Case No. C-1-79-660.

The District Court, on Feb. 4, 1982, set the case for "...trial or default on March 22, 1982..." Appendix A.

March 5, 1982, petitioner-plaintiff, Johnson's, Offer of Stipulation to Consent Judgment or Settlement in Civil Action No. C-1-79-660, was filed in the District Court: offer to withdraw demand for $20.000,00 in punitive damages from defendants Jago and Adams; and withdraw $30.000,00 in punitive damages from defendants Marshall and Denton, if the state would agree to Consent Judgment or Settlement awarding petitioner, Johnson, $265.000,00 total general damages, on/ or prior to trial date scheduled for March 22, 1982. Defendants did not stipulate to this agreement.

Also, March 5, 1982, from 10:15 A.M. to 11:00., petitioner participated in a pretrial conference via three-way telephone conversation with U.S. District Court Judge, S. Arthur Spiegel and John C. Stamatakos, Assistant Attorney General. Entry was also filed by the District Court 3/5/82 vacating trial date set for March 22, 1982,

and denying default judgment. Appendix C. During the pretrial conference 3/5/82 John C. Stamatakos, Assistant Attorney General, did verbally agree to travel to SOCF on at least one day in the week prior to 3/22/82 to cooperate with petitioner, Johnson, in formulating another final pretrial order.

The Court of Appeals denied petitioner's Mandamus action, Case No. 82-8320, March 11, 1982. Appendix B.

March 26, 1982, the Court of Appeals filed petitioner's Motion for Stay and Reconsideration on Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 82-8320.

April 19, 1982, the Appeals Court denied petitioner's Motion for Stay and Reconsideration on Petition for Writ of Mandamus, Case No. 82-8320. Appendix D.

FOR CONSOLIDATION AND HEARING WITH:

Order filed June 25, 1982, by the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals, denying relief in:Johnson vs. Marshall, et al. Case No. 81-3741, habeas corpus, filed in the Appeals Court December 17, 1981, as Expedited Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division. The Brief is twenty (20) pages long, and cites twenty-six (26) state and federal cases in support; petitioner received respondent's Reply Brief January 20, 1982, prepared by Elizabeth M. Dean, Assistant Attorney General, State of Ohio; petitioner, Johnson's, twelve (12) page Reply Brief, citing eleven (11) state and federal cases in support was filed Feb. 5, 1982, in the Appeals Court. The four (4) grounds for habeas corpus relief are:

(1) DENIED SPEEDY TRIAL UNDER O.R.C. 2945.71-73 AND THE 6TH, AND 14TH AMENDMENTS TO U.S. CONSTITUTION.

(2) DENIED EFFECTIVE ASSISTANCE OF COUNSEL UNDER THE 6TH AND 14TH AMENDMENTS TO U.S. CONSTITUTION.

(3) DENIED ACCESS TO STATE AND FEDERAL COURTS AS GUARANTEED BY 1ST AND 14TH AMENDMENTS U.S. CONSTITUTION.

(4) CONVICTIONS OBTAINED BY VIOLATION OF PROTECTION AGAINST DOUBLE JEOPARDY UNDER 5TH AND 14TH AMENDMENTS.

Jurisdiction of habeas corpus was conferred to the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court Appeals by Notice of Appeal and Request for Certificate of Probable Cause 28 U.S.C. 2253, being filed in U.S. District Court, Cincinnati, Ohio, Oct. 28, 1981, Nov. 5, 1981, the District Court granted Certificate of Probable Cause 28 U.S.C. 2253.

June 30, 1982, the United Stated Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, Received petitioner's Notice of Appeal 28 U.S.C. 1253 & 2101 (b) (c) to the United States Supreme Court, from the Appeal Court's Order filed June 25, 1982, denying habeas corpus.

REASON FOR GRANTING THE WRIT

Where defendants have failed to plead or otherwise defend or make discovery as provided by the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, due process and equal protection of the laws demand that judgment by default be entered on behalf of petitioner.

In Schlagenhauf v. Holder, this court established when "...the issue concerns the construction and application of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. It is thus appropriate for us to determine on the merits the issues presented and to formulate the necessary guidelines in this area." 85 S.Ct. at page 239 (1964).

In petitioner, Johnson's, original Statement of The Claim, Case No. C-1-79-660, filed November 28, 1979, the District Court, allegations are made in paragraph 3, "...during the past year (365) days, from September 17, 1978, through September 17, 1979, he has had only (3) three writs notarized..."

That on two (2) occasions, approximately 1:15 P.M. Monday, September 17, 1979, paragraph 5, and on April 23, 1979, paragraph 7, he requested defendant Adams to notarize documents to be filed in the Courts and that defendant Adams refused to notarize the documents.

In Defendants' Motion to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support of Motion dated Jan. 5, 1980, page -2- the second paragraph, defendant Adams admitted through Counsel, John C. Stamatakos: "The fact that Defendant refusedto notarize the four writs intended for the federal court did not deny Plaintiff his right of access to the courts, since Plaintiff could have prepared and signed his declaration to each writ." Referring to 28 U.S.C. 1746 Unsworn declarations under penalty of perjury.

In petitioner-plaintiff's Motion in Opposition to Dismiss and Memorandum in Support of Motion filed Jan. 24, 1980, in the District Court, he argued "...U.S.C.A. Title 28 §§ 1746 was not enacted by Congress to displace the function of Notary Publics throughout the various states." In fact, the legislative history of this statute as recorded in the Cong. Record Vol. 122, at page 5645 (1976) teaches its purpose to be that:

> "The requirement that the person who signs an affidavit must appear before a notary and be sworn can be inconvenient. For example, it may be necessary for the document to be executed during other than normal business hours. Further the document may have to be executed in another country for use in the United States... The legislation provides an alternative to affidavits and sworn documents when it is necessary to require verification of the truthfulness of what the document contains."

There were other witnesses present both times (9/17/79 and 4/23/79) When defendant Adams refused petitioner's request for notarial services, that said days were weekdays during "...normal business hours." On the latter date, as written here, April 23, 1979, he notarized document(s) for other prisoner(s) in petitioner's and other witnesses' presence. Paragraph 7, Amended Complaint filed Jan. 24, 1980, in the District Court.

By reason of defendant Adams' job assignment as Supervisor of Inmate Legal Services Department, SOCF and Notary Public, State of Ohio, he was required by law, to notarize petitioner's documents. Bounds v. Smith, 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct. 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d 72 (1977): "Indigent inmates must be provided at state expense with paper and pen to draft legal documents, with notarial services to authenticate them and stamps to mail them." At page 81.

In regards to discretionary review, Bounds v. Smith, this Court held that, "...review is generally granted only if a case raises an issue of significant public interest..." 430 U.S. 817, 97 S.Ct. 1491, 52 L.Ed.2d 72 (1977), at page 82.

Petitioner's Conspiracy Theory:

Petitioner says, the instant action "...raises an issue of significant public interest..." Bound v. Smith, supra, at p. 82. Petitioner's Amended Complaint filed in the District Court Jan. 24, 1980, paragraph 1: "...Plaintiff is an American citizen of the race...commonly referred to as...black persons. The five named defendants herein: Jago, Adams, Crabtree, Denton, and Rhodes are white persons, employeed as either officers, agents, or servants of the State of Ohio." Paragraph 2: "Plaintiff has been in state's custody since May 1976..." Paragraph 6:

> "That pursuant to O.R.C. 5145.04, 5145.20, and 5145.22, the Ohio Department of Rehabilitation and Corrections is required to maintain records of prisoners in its custody; and that, from December 6, 1978 to December 26, 1978, plaintiff was involuntarily committed at the Western Reserve Psychiatric Habilitation Center (W.R.P.H.C.), and as the result of a well publicized class action law suit against the Superintendent of (W.R.P.H.C.) in which, Rhodes, was also a defendant, see, Rone v. Fireman, 473 F.Supp. 92 (1979). That, therefore, defendants Jago, Adams, Denton, and Rhodes knew, or should have known, that according to the ruling in Rone v. Fireman, supra, plaintiff's rights under the 14th Amendment to the U.S. Constitution were violated while at (W.R.P.H.C.), specifically; in that there was no notarial services, nor, a law library which plaintiff was allowed to make use of while at (W.R.P. H.C.). That plaintiff did submit a Habeas Corpus in pro se, to the Ohio Supreme Court, December 13, 1978, which was dismissed March 15, 1979, without hearing before that court. And, that, there was no affirmative action taken by said defendants to prevent a reoccurrence of the deprivation of plaintiff's right; to reasonable availability of notarial services, upon plaintiff's return to (S.O.C.F.) on April 11, 1979, which was contributory to the adverse ruling against plaintiff's Civil Rights Suits as described in count 5 of this complaint, depriving plaintiff of his "day in Court".

Thus far, at all times during the pendency of this action in the District Court, all named defendants, herein who were or are defendant Adams' superiors: Jago, and his successor Marshall; Denton, and Rhodes, all willingly joined the conspiracy to deny petitioner, Johnson, access to the Courts by their condoning or ratification of defendant Adams' actions, or inactions, omissions, and nonperformance of mandatory duties: this is so, because in the written and oral

communications petitioner has received from defendants through their counsel of record, they do not indicate they initiated any form of disciplinary proceedings against defendant Adams.

That defendants' actions or inactions et cetera, as described, herein, were motivated by: "...invidious class and race discrimination under color of state law..." Petitioner's Amended Complaint, paragraph 2.

Defendants Default:

The Court of Appeals Order filed April 19, 1982, denying petitioner's mandamus is not founded on facts and was decided in a way in conflict with applicable decisions of this Court. The Appeals Court makes a quantum leap from citing no relevent case law from the Sixth Circuit in this matter to citing: Kerr v. U.S. District Court, 426 U.S. 394 (1976).

Petitioner says, 28 U.S.C. Rules 15, Amended and Supplemental Pleadings (a) (b) (c) (d); Rule 19, Joinder of Persons Needed for Just Adjudication (a), were not at issue in the Kerr, decision, supra, thus, said case is inapplicable to the instant action.

Whereas, in the instant action, pursuant to petitioner's Motion for Leave To Amend Complaint, with the Amended Complaint attached filed in the District Court Jan. 24, 1980, 28 U.S.C. Rules 15, Supplemental Pleadings (a) (b) (c) (d); and Rule 19, (a) are cited.

Whether mandamus should issue turns, "primarily" upon the District Court's failure to enter judgment by default when defendants Jago, et al., did not plead or otherwise defend, per Order of the District Court filed Nov. 5, 1980, "...Pursuant to the liberal amendment provisions under Fed. R. Civ. P. 15 (a) the Court granted Plaintiff's Motion to Amend his Complaint...It is hereby ORDERED that Defendants move or plead to Plaintiff's Amended Complaint within ten days of receipt of this Order." Signed Robert A. Steinberg, United States Magistrate.

Only, defendants Jago and Adams responded to petitioner's Amended Complaint, and without obtaining an enlargement of time from the Court to plead or defend, they were in default of Service oftheir Answer to the Amended Complaint on petitioner until Nov. 25, 1980.

Defendant Adams' blanket refusal to make discovery: Petitioner's First Set of Interrogatories (75) March 26, 1980, and Feb. 11, 1981; Petitioner's First Set of Request for Admissions of Fact (10), also 3/11/81, 28 U.S.C. Rules 33, and 36, are supplemental reasons for entry of judgment by default. Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. Rule 37 (b) (c) (d).

"Refusal of defendant to obey court's orders constituted sufficient grounds for entry of a default judgment against him." From, Bonanza Intern., Inc. v. Corceller, 480 F.2d 613.

As a matter of law the allegations in petitioner's Amended Complaint filed Jan. 24, 1980, in the District Court should be taken as true, and the relief prayed for in his mandamus action granted.

The Entry filed March 5, 1982, by the District Court denying petitioner's Motion for Default Judgment was done without citing case law and federal rule and is a judicial usupation of power by encroachment upon the legislative branch of the federal government because it voids and nullified 28 U.S.C. Rules 15, and 37, and 55, and subdivisions therein; and voids and nullified Rules 33, and 36,

Without, excuse, defendants' counsel John C. Stamatakos, reneged on oral commitment made March 5, 1982, via telephone, to travel to SOCF and cooperate with petitioner in formulating another final pre-trial order.

By Appeals Court Order filed April 19, 1982, denying petitioner's mandamus, Case No. 82-8320, it has so far departed from the accepted, and usual course of judicial proceedings, or so far sanctioned such a departure by a lower court as to call for an exercise of this Court's power of supervision

Key Link Between Petitioner's Mandamus and Habeas Corpus Actions:

As succinctly stated in both petitioner's Civil Rights Action and Habeas Corpus, herein, he claims to be "denied access to state and federal courts as guaranteed by 1st and 14th Amendments U.S. Constitution." After Order filed Feb. 4, 1982, by the District Court setting either "...trial or default on March 22, 1982..." Appendix A. The Court was, and is bound by the Rule in Holt v. Pitts, wherein, the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals established:

> "...when an inmate's civil action reaches the trial stage and his claim proves sufficiently meritorious to survive motions for dismissal and summary judgment, a court must then take all reasonable steps necessary to insure that the inmate receives the fair 'day in Court' to which he is entitled. (... a district court must pursue several avenues in an effort to decide fairly the merits of an inmate's pro se civil rights action; these avenues include the issuance of a writ commanding the presence of the prisoner-plaintiff, a bench trial in the prison, the presentation of evidence by means of depositions, the appointment of counsel, and the postponement of the case if the plaintiff is to be released in a reasonable time)." 619 F.2d 558 (1980). At page 562.

Postponement of petitioner, Johnson's, Civil Rights Case is unreasonable because he is not eligible for release from state's custody, via parole under this term of imprisonment, until June 1986.

The District Court and Appeals Court denial of petitioner's Motion for Default Judgment and Mandamus and Habeas Corpus, while failing to grant him his "...day in Court..." as annunicated by Rule in Holt v. Pitts, 619 F.2d 558 (6th Cir. 1980) at page 562, affords petitioner no remedy at all, in law.

Petitioner requests the Court to fully review the Briefs, Motions, and Orders, filed in the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals as Case No. 81-3741, habeas corpus, Expedited Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division.

In summary: habeas corpus relief is founded on the grounds that upon petitioner's criminal convictions reversal: State v. Johnson, 57 Ohio App.2d 263, 387 N.E.2d 247 (June 22, 1978), after timely demand for speedy trial to the trial Court, Aug. 15, 1978, he was re-convicted April 2, 1979, on the same indictment in violation of the Ohio Revised Code, 90-day speedy trial mandate 2945.71-73. State v. Cross, 26 Ohio St.2d 270, 271 N.E.2d 264 (June 23, 1971) is controlling, wherein the Ohio Supreme Court ordered the accused discharged from state's custody under O.R.C. 2945.73, because of approximately a ten (10) month delay in bringing him to trial.

In the instant case, petitioner did experience substantial actual prejudice during delay in being brought to re-trial, and as more fully stated in his Amended Complaint filed Jan. 24, 1980, and is still pending as Johnson vs. Jago, et al. Civil Rights Complaint, Case No. C-1-79-660, U.S. Dist. Ct. Cincinnati, Ohio and as supported and sustained by the ruling in Rone et al. vs. Fireman, et al. 473 F.Supp. 92 (1979).

The Ohio Supreme Court; the U.S. Dist. Ct. at Cincinnati, Ohio and the U.S. Sixth Cir. Ct. of Apps., have had the opportunity to rule on petitioner's grounds for habeas relief, in short: (1) "... denied speedy trial..."; (2) "...denied effective assistance of counsel..."; (4) "...double jeopardy..."; (3) "...denied access to state and federal Courts..." is admitted by the state as the result of defaulted answer to petitioner's Amended Complaint, filed Jan. 24, 1980, in Johnson vs. Jago, et al. supra, U.S. Dist. Ct. Cincinnati, Ohio.

The U.S. Sixth Cir. Ct. of Apps., is in err in denying habeas relief, Order June 25, 1982, without appointment of counsel, as was requested and without taking into consideration the length of delay at re-trial, the reason for delay, and resulting prejudice to petitioner, etc. Barker v. Wingo, 92 S.Ct. (1972) approximately page 2182. 4/

4/ Monday, June 28, 1982, petitioner received Order (8½ in. x 11 in.) two pages, filed June 25, 1982, in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, before Judges Keith, Krupansky and Phillips, the signature of John P. Hehman, Clerk is on the second page of the Order, Case No. 81-3741, Johnson vs. Marshall, Dist. Ct. No. C-1-81-827. A brief note from the Appeals Court signed by (Mr.) Gary Mc Carthy, Deputy Clerk, was enclosed, too.

Sunday, July 4, 1982, petitioner enclosed the above said Order from the Appeals Court in a large clasp envelope addressed to C.R. Maloy, Business Administrator, SOCF, with instructions to be photocopied 4 times for appendix to this writ. Petitioner gave it to Officer E.R. McJunkin, #649 for delivery; ~~but the Order and photocopies have not been returned to petitioner. Petitioner considers them confiscated by the prison administration.~~

CONCLUSION

Because of an indentical issue, and other subsidiary, and closely related issues, petitioner prays that the Court consolidate for review, hearing and oral argument on the merits, the mandamus and habeas corpus actions herein.

On the basis of defendants' default in the underlying civil rights suit herein petitioner asks the Court to enter judgment in his favor for: $145.000,00 in general damages and $20.000,00---- in punitive damages, with maximum interest allowed by state law commencing with trial schedule date of March 22, 1982, Appendix A.

Issue Order to respondent trial Court to promptly set a trial date and proceed to judgment on the issue of additional damages as prayed for in footnote 2 of page 12 of this writ.

Restore petitioner's full civil rights as an American citizen by ordering his unconditional discharge from state's custody on the claims in the underlying civil rights suit, mandamus and habeas corpus actions herein.

APPENDIX A

FILED
FEB 4 2 19 PM '82
WEST DIV. CINCINNATI

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

ORLANDO JOHNSON,

Plaintiff, NO: C-1-79-660

vs.

ARNOLD R. JAGO, et al., ORDER

Defendants.

Issued
Docketed
Journal
Motion
Issue
Card

It has come to this Court's attention, due to plaintiff's filing of a writ of mandamus in the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals in which this Court was named as a respondent, that this Court has failed to rule on a motion for default judgment (doc. 23) filed by plaintiff on March 19, 1981, and has, although this case was referred by the Magistrate for this Court for trial on October 26, 1981, neglected to set this case for trial.

Therefore, for the above reasons, and due to the dilatory tactics by the defendants in failing to comply with orders issued by the Magistrate while the case was transferred to him and in refusing to comply with plaintiff's requests for discovery, this case is set for trial or default on March 22, 1982, at 9:30 A.M., in Courtroom 842. The case is number three on deck. A pretrial conference will be held on February 17, 1982, at 3:30 P.M., at which defendants are ordered to make plaintiff available by telephone. At that time the Court will inquire of the parties as to the status of their discovery, the availability of witnesses and documentary evidence each wishes to present at trial, and whether any reasons exist why a subpoena ad testificandum should not issue for plaintiff's presence at trial.

SO ORDERED.

S. Arthur Spiegel
United States District Judge

RECEIVED
JUN 07 1982
S.O.C.F.
PROCESS ADMINISTRATOR

RECEIVED
JUN 14 1982
S.O.C.F.

No. 82-8320

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED

MAR 11 1982

JOHN P. HEHMAN, Clerk

ORLANDO JOHNSON,

Petitioner,

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO,
WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI,

Respondent

O R D E R

APPENDIX B

BEFORE: BROWN, KENNEDY and MARTIN, Circuit Judges.

The petitioner seeks a writ of mandamus directing the District Court to grant his motion for default judgment in his civil rights action now pending in the District Court or, in the alternative, to set the case for trial.

In response to this petition, the District Court has forwarded a copy of an order entered on February 4, 1982 setting the petitioner's civil rights action for trial or default on March 22, 1982.

Therefore, it appearing that the relief requested by the petitioner in his petition for writ of mandamus has been granted,

It is ORDERED that the petition be and it hereby is denied as moot.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

John P. Hehman
Clerk

RECEIVED
JUN
S.C.
BUSINESS AD

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO
WESTERN DIVISION

FILED
JOHN D. LYTER, CLERK
MAR 5 3 22 PM '82

ORLANDO JOHNSON, :

Plaintiff, : No. C-1-79-660

vs. :

ARNOLD R. JAGO, et al., : ENTRY

Defendants. :

Received
Docketed
Journal
Mailed
Issue
Card

This case came before the Court for a final pre-trial conference on March 5, 1982. During the course of the conference, plaintiff raised the issue of his motion for default judgment. The Court indicated that it denied this motion, but that plaintiff could preserve the issue for the Court of Appeals.

At the conference it became apparent, from difficulties with the final pre-trial order, that the trial date now set for March 22, 1982, must be vacated. Defendants' counsel will work with the plaintiff to prepare a final pre-trial order. After the final pre-trial order is prepared, the Court will set a date for another final pre-trial conference, at which time a firm trial date will be chosen. It is the Court's intention that, with the cooperation of the parties, this case will proceed to trial at the earliest possible time.

SO ORDERED.

S. Arthur Spiegel
United States District Judge

APPENDIX C

RECEIVED
MAR 1982
O.C.C.P.
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

RECEIVED
MAR 1982
O.C.C.P.
BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

No. 82-8320

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

FILED

APR 19 1982

JOHN P. HEHMAN, Clerk

ORLANDO JOHNSON,

Petitioner

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT,
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF OHIO,
WESTERN DIVISION AT CINCINNATI,

Respondent

ORDER

RECEIVED
1982
E.O.C.F.
PRESS ADMINISTRATOR

Before: BROWN, KENNEDY, and MARTIN, Circuit Judges

Petitioner has moved for reconsideration of our order of March 11, 1982 which denied his petition for a writ of mandamus. He argues that the issue was not moot. He also requests a new writ of mandamus to District Court for the Southern District of Ohio to enter a default judgment in his civil rights action. He further seeks mandamus to set a trial date and proceed to trial on claim for additional damages.

We denied as moot his earlier motion on the ground that the relief requested in the petition had been granted by the District Court in an order of February 4, 1982. Petitioner in his motion for reconsideration, however, now states that the trial date was continued by the District Court.

APPENDIX D

Despite that change of circumstances we believe the petitioner has failed to demonstrate that mandamus relief is warranted. He has not established his right to entry of a default judgment, and efforts are being made to set his civil rights action for trial. He has failed to demonstrate the existence of circumstances which would justify the granting of the extraordinary remedy of mandamus, Kerr v. U.S. District Court, 426 U.S. 394 (1976).

It is ORDERED that the motion for reconsideration be and it hereby is denied.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

Clerk

PAGE 2 OF APPENDIX D

RECEIVED

ADMINISTRATOR

No. 81-3741

FILED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

JUN 25 1982

JOHN P. HEHMAN, Clerk

ORLANDO JOHNSON,
Petitioner-Appellant

v.

RONALD C. MARSHALL, SUPT.,
Respondent-Appellee

O R D E R

BEFORE: KEITH and KRUPANSKY, Circuit Judges; and PHILLIPS, Senior Circuit Judge

Johnson requests counsel for his appeal fromthe District Court's order dismissing Johnson's habeas corpus petition. Johnson was convicted of various counts of murder, attempted murder, and felonious assault after he went on a shooting spree at the Cleveland, Ohio machine manufacturing company where he had previously worked. The District Court dismissed the petition for failure to exhaust state remedies. This appeal has been referred to a panel of the Court pursuant to Rule 9 (a), Rules of the Sixth Circuit. After an examination of the record and the briefs, this panel agrees unanimously that oral argument is not needed. Rule 34 (a), Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.

Johnson's initial conviction was reversed on appeal. After his second conviction, Johnson failed to appeal. Instead, he filed a habeas corpus petition with the Ohio Supreme Court. The petition was denied. A petition to the federal district court in Cleveland was denied for failure to exhaust state remedies.

The present petition, filed in the Southern District of Ohio, alleges four issues: that Johnson's right to a speedy trial was violated, that

APPENDIX E

he was deprived of the effective assistance of counsel, that he was denied access to the courts, and that his retrial caused him to be subject to double jeopardy. The District Court held that Johnson had not exhausted his state remedies because delayed appeal and post-conviction relief were still available. Keener v. Ridenour, 594 F.2d 581, 584-5 (6th Cir. 1979), later appeal, Keener v. Taylor, 640 F.2d 839 (1981). Johnson argues that, under Keener, a petitioner is not required to make repetitive applications in the state courts. Id. at 584. According to Johnson, his habeas corpus application to the Ohio Supreme Court was adequate to exhaust his state remedies.

Johnson's argument is incorrect for two reasons. First, a writ of habeas corpus is not available from the Ohio Supreme Court for a petitioner in custody under an order of a criminal court of competent jurisdiction. Stahl v. Shoemaker, 50 Ohio St.2d 351, 354 (1977). Johnson's petition to the Ohio Supreme Court was not an attempt to pursue an adequate state remedy, so the rule in Keener would not apply. Second, Johnson only presented his first and fourth issues to the Ohio Supreme Court. The second and third issues remain unexhausted. In this situation, the District Court must dismiss the entire petition. Rose v. Lundy, __ U.S. __, 102 S.Ct. 1198, 1205 (1982). Therefore, the District Court's decision can be affirmed based on Rose.

We have considered Johnson's other arguments and find them without merit. Accordingly, the motion for counsel is denied. The order of the District Court is affirmed under Rule 9 (d) 3, Rules of the Sixth Circuit, beause the issues are not substantial and do not require oral argument.

ENTERED BY ORDER OF THE COURT

John P. Hehman
Clerk

RECEIVED

MAY 10 1982

JOHN P. HEHMAN, Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
CINCINNATI, OHIO

ORLANDO JOHNSON, Petitioner	CASE No. 82-8320
vs.	PETITION FOR WRIT OF MANDAMUS 28 U.S.C. § 1651 Fed. R. App. P. 21(a)(b)
U.S. District Court Judges S. ARTHUR SPIEGEL and DAVID S. PORTER, United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Western Division	MOTION FOR STAY AND RECONSIDERATION Sixth Circuit Rule 8(b)(c) MOTIONS AND MOTION PRACTICE Fed. R. App. P. 27 (a)(b)(c)
Respondents	

NOTICE OF APPEAL
28 U.S.C. § 1253 § 2101 (b) (c)

Notice is hereby given that, ORLANDO JOHNSON, petitioner above named, appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States from the Order of the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals denying relief of Petition for Writ of Mandamus, as prayed for, entered in this action on the 11th day of March, 1982; and on final Order denying Motion for Stay and Reconsideration on Petition for Writ of Mandamus, in the same action, on the 19th day of April 1982.

DATED: Thursday, May 6, 1982.

Orlando Johnson
ORLANDO JOHNSON, pro se

Sworn to before me and subscribed in my presence this 6th day of May 1982.

"Request for notary made; notary not available."
Notary Seal
NOTARY PUBLIC

"I declare under penalty of perjury the forgoing is true and correct."

Orlando Johnson

Orlando Johnson, pro se
Serial No. 146-602
P.O. Box 45699
Lucasville, Ohio 45699-0001

APPENDIX F

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, ORLANDO JOHNSON, hereby certify that true and correct copy of Notice of Appeal in Case No. 82-8320, ORLANDO JOHNSON vs. U.S. District Court Judges S. ARTHUR SPIEGEL and DAVID S. PORTER, United States District Court, Southern District of Ohio, Western Division, from the Order of the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals denying relief of Petition for Writ of Mandamus, entered the 11th day of March, 1982; and final Order denying Motion for Stay and Reconsideration on Petition for Writ of Mandamus, in the same action, on the 19th day of April 1982, were given to a correctional officer, Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, for placement in the U.S. First Class Mail:

__5__ copies to: Office of the Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

__1__ copy to: Office of the Clerk, U.S. District Court, Cincinnati, Ohio 45202.

__1__ copy to: John C. Stamatakos, Assistant Attorney General, State of Ohio, State Office Tower, 30 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43216.

DATED: Thursday, May 6, 1982

"I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct."

Orlando Johnson

Orlando Johnson,
Serial No. 146-602
P.O. Box 45699
Lucasville, Ohio 45699-0001

RECEIVED
JUN 30 1982
JOHN P. HEHMAN, Clerk

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT
CINCINNATI, OHIO

ORLANDO JOHNSON Petitioner vs. RONAL C. MARSHALL, et al. Respondents	)	CASE No. 81-3741 APPEAL FROM THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

NOTICE OF APPEAL

28 U.S.C. § 1253 § 2101 (b) (c)

Notice is hereby given that, ORLANDO JOHNSON, pe r above named, appeals to the Supreme Court of the Unite s from the Order of the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeal ng relief in habeas corpus action, Expedited peal from the States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Wes , Division, as prayed for, entered in this action on the 25th d y o June, 1982.

DATED: Tuesday, June 29, 1982

Orlando Joh
ORLANDO JOHNSON, pro s

"I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct."

Orlando Johnson
Orlando Johnson, pro se
Serial No. 146-602
P.O. Box 45699
Lucasville, Ohio 45699-0001

APPENDIX G

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I, ORLANDO JOHNSON, certify that true and correct copy of Notice of Appeal in Case No. 81-3741, to the Supreme Court of the United States from the Order of the U.S. Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals denying relief in habeas corpus action, Expedited Appeal from the United States District Court for the Southern District of Ohio Western Division, as prayed for, entered in this action on the 25th day of June, 1982, were given to a correctional officer, Southern Ohio Correctional Facility, for placement in the U.S. First Class Mail:

__5__ copies to: Office of the Clerk, U.S. Court of Appeals for the Sixth Circuit, Cincinnati, Ohio45202.

__1__ copy to: ELIZABETH M. DEAN, Assistant Attorney General, State Office Tower, 30 East Broad Street, Columbus, Ohio 43215.

DATED: Tuesday, June 29, 1982

"I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct."

Orlando Johnson

Orlando Johnson, pro se
Serial No. 146-602
P.O. Box 45699
Lucasville, Ohio 45699-0001

PAGE 2 OF APPENDIX G

(Amended Substitute Senate Bill No. 76)
AN ACT enacted by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio

Sec. 9.87. (A) THE STATE SHALL, EXCEPT AS PROVIDED IN DIVISION (B) OF THIS SECTION, INDEMNIFY AN OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE FROM LIABILITY INCURRED IN THE PERFORMANCE OF HIS DUTIES BY PAYING ANY JUDGMENT IN, OR AMOUNT NEGOTIATED IN SETTLEMENT OF, ANY CIVIL ACTION ARISING UNDER FEDERAL LAW, THE LAW OF ANOTHER STATE, OR THE LAW OF A FOREIGN JURISDICTION. THE REASONABLENESS OF THE AMOUNT OF ANY CONSENT JUDGMENT OR SETTLEMENT IS SUBJECT TO THE REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL AND OF THE DIRECTOR, ADMINISTRATIVE CHIEF, OR GOVERNING BODY OF THE EMPLOYER OF THE OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE WHO IS TO THE INDEMNIFIED. THE MAXIMUM AGGREGATE AMOUNT OF INDEMNIFICATION PAID DIRECTLY FROM STATE FUNDS TO OR ON BEHALF OF ANY OFFICER OR EMPLOYEE PURSUANT TO THIS DIVISION SHALL BE ONE MILLION DOLLARS PER OCCURRENCE, REGARDLESS OF THE NUMBER OF PERSONS WHO SUFFER DAMAGE, INJURY, OR DEATH AS A RESULT OF THE OCCURRENCE.

Section 6. The state, pursuant to and in accordance with the procedure in section 9.87 of the Revised Code as enacted by this act, may indemnify an officer or employee from liability incurred in the performance of his duties prior to the effective date of this act, if the action that has been brought, or could be brought, seeking to impose the liability has not reached final judgment or has not been settled as of the effective date of this act and if the state is not the plaintiff in the action.

"State" and "officer or employee," as used in this section, have the same meaning as in section 9.85 of the Revised Code, as enacted by this act.

Section 7. This act is hereby declared to be an emergency measure necessary for the immediate preservation of the public peace, health, and safety. The reason for such necessity lies in the fact that immediate action is necessary to protect state officers and employees from having to pay large court judgments for acts committed while performing their duties. Therefore, this act shall go into immediate effect.

Passed February 19, 1980

Approved March 13, 1980

APPENDIX H

82-5102

RECEIVED
JUL 21 1982
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

ORLANDO JOHNSON, et al. Petitioner-Appellant vs. UNITED STATES Dist. Ct. for the SOUTHERN Dist. of OHIO, W. Div., et al. Respondent-Appellees	)	CASE No. _____ APPEAL FROM/ OR ALTERATIVELY PETITION FOR WRIT OF CERTIORARI TO THE UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS FOR THE SIXTH CIRCUIT

MOTION FOR LEAVE TO PROCEED IN FORMA PAUPERIS
AND FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

The petitioner, ORLANDO JOHNSON, askes leave to file the attached Appeal/ or alteratively Petition for Writ of Certiorari without prepayment of costs, and to proceed in forma pauperis, 28 U.S.C. § 1915 (d), and for Court appointed counsel, under the conditions that counsel shall not file any oral or written pleadings in this litigation without prior consultation with petitioner.

Petitioner has previously been granted leave to proceed in both the U.S. District Court and the U.S. Court of Appeals. His affidavit in support of this motion is attached hereto.

DATED: Friday July 16, 1982 Orlando Johnson

Orlando Johnson, pro se
Serial No. 146-602
P.O. Box 45699
Lucasville, Ohio 45699-0001

AFFIDAVIT

I, ORLANDO JOHNSON, being first duly sworn according to law, depose and say that I am the petitioner in the above entitled case; that in support of my motion to proceed without being required to prepay fees, costs or give security therefor, and that I believe I am entitled to redress.

I further swear that the statements which I have made below relating to my inability to pay the cost of proceeding in this Court are true.

1) Petitioner is not presently employed.

Petitioner was last employed in May of 1976. Petitioner then earned approximately $700.00 a month.

2) As a state prisoner, petitioner received $3.00 a month from the State of Ohio, for the past twelve months.

3) During the past twelve months petitioner has received approximately $100.00 in small loans from relatives.

4) Petitioner has less than $20.00 in his personal prison account.

5) Petitioner does not own real estate, stocks, bonds, notes, automobiles or other valuable property.

6) No persons are dependant upon petitioner for support.

I understand that statement or answer to any questions in this affidavit will subject me to penalties for perjury.

Orlando Johnson
Orlando Johnson, pro se

Sworn to before me, and subscribed in my presence, this 16th day of July 1982.

Request for notary made; notary not available.
Notary Seal Notary Public

"I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing is true and correct."

Orlando Johnson

Orlando Johnson, pro se
Serial No. 146-602
P.O. Box 45699
Lucasville, Ohio 45699-0001